THE COMMONWEAL

A Weekly Review of Literature, The Arts, and Public Affairs.

Volume X | New York, Wednesday, July 3, 1929 | Number 9

EDITORIAL BOARD
MICHAEL WILLIAMS, Editor
GEORGE N. SHUSTER, Managing Editor
MARY KOLARS, Assistant Editor

JOHN F. McCORMICK, Business Manager

EDITORIAL COUNCIL
CARLTON J. H. HAYES
T. LAWRASON RIGGS
RICHARD DANA SKINNER
JAMES J. WALSH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Frankness in the Forum 243

Week by Week 244

Those Very Dark Ages 248

The Sphinx Commission ..... William C. Murphy, jr. 249

Proud White Waves *(verse)* ..... Louis Ginsberg 250

Music in France and Germany ..... Karl Schaezler 251

National Origins in Pennsylvania ..... Frank Rahill 253

Church and State in Japan ..... Johannes Laures 255

To a Disappointed Pilgrim *(verse)* ..... Witter Bynner 257

Communications 257

Books ..... Georgiana Putnam McEntee, William Franklin Sands, Edythe Helen Browne, Paul Crowley, John Gilland Brunini 258

Published weekly and copyrighted 1929, in the United States by the Calvert Publishing Corporation, Grand Central Terminal, New York, N. Y. United States: $5.00; Foreign: $6.00; Canada: $5.50. Single Copies: $.10.

FRANKNESS IN THE FORUM

THAT public interest in the settlement of the Roman question should still be keen is only to be expected, considering the high importance of that event. It is, therefore, natural that our energetic contemporary, the Forum, should keep up the discussion. It is to be regretted that it keeps it up in such a deplorable fashion as is exemplified by Mr. David A. Orebaugh's article in its July number, which is quite the most misleading contribution to the subject that has come to our attention. It is described on the cover as being "a frank Protestant view." That it may be frank we are under no temptation to deny, although, to be frank ourselves, we wonder a little why it was necessary to say so. Is there any reason why a writer on this subject—or any other, for that matter—whether he be expressing a Protestant view, a Catholic view, a Jewish view, or any sort of view, should not be frank? This particular article, however, is a number of other things in addition to being frank. We have already called it a "deplorable" article; perhaps it would be well (frankly) to say why we think so.

Although Mr. David A. Orebaugh, the Forum tells us, "has always been deeply interested in civic, socio-logic and religious questions," he "has had little time to develop these interests because of the exactions of his professional work in Chicago, where he has been a corporation lawyer since 1904." While this gives us no special light on the question of whether Mr. Orebaugh had or had not made himself familiar with the many important aspects of his theme, nevertheless it does convey one fact which, to our minds at least, should give a sense of security to a reader of his article. This fact, of course, is that Mr. Orebaugh is a lawyer. The study and practice of law may not have a direct bearing upon the Roman question; but it should (so we perhaps somewhat naively think) equip a writer to gather and deal with matters of fact, and to do so in a matter-of-fact, precise and accurately descriptive way.

With this in mind, we confess that we were rather badly shocked by our perusal of the very first paragraph of Mr. Orebaugh's article, in which he tells his readers that 20,000,000 American Catholics "have sworn fealty to the Vatican while at the same time owing allegiance to the American state." He then proceeds to draw a pathetic picture of these 20,000,000 American Catholics. "Halting between their

LIBRARY
ST. CHARLES SEMINARY
CARTHAGENA, OHIO
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

religious fealty and their national fealty," he says, "they experience a humiliating uncertainty concerning their status as American citizens. They are in a quandary to know which of these fealties they shall abjure, realizing that they cannot consistently hold to both."

Something of the difficulty which confronts The Commonweal, and indeed most Catholic journals and writers who attempt the necessary task of discussing subjects relating to the Catholic Church which are connected with other matters of general interest, is acutely exemplified by a brief consideration of these statements of Mr. Orebaugh, together with the fact that they are published in a magazine such as the Forum. This difficulty is that so few writers not of the Catholic faith seem to think it worth while to be accurate when dealing with that subject. Ambiguity and vagueness and a positively reckless display of ignorance in many instances mark their work. If Mr. Orebaugh were writing for the Forum on any other subject—let us say, on the settlement of the international debt plan by the financial experts in Paris—everybody concerned with his article, himself, the editor of the magazine publishing it, and his readers, would expect him to know the facts he was dealing with, and be able to express them with accuracy. Before, therefore, giving any serious consideration to Mr. Orebaugh's article, we ask him (or the Forum) please to answer the following questions:

When and where have 20,000,000 American citizens ever "sworn fealty to the Vatican"? What are the terms of the oath they took? Who administered it? Or does Mr. Orebaugh really think that such an oath was administered in secret, in the mysterious depths of Catholic churches, perhaps in those basements in which—according to many other Protestant writers about the Catholic Church—the Papists conceal their arms and ammunition in preparation for the day when they mean to march against Senator Heflin? Does the Forum share his belief?

For, of course, if Mr. Orebaugh is wrong (and the truth is that not even one American, to say nothing about 20,000,000, has ever taken such an oath, for the reason that there is no such oath to take, and if there were nobody would take it anyhow)—why, obviously, all of Mr. Orebaugh's doubts and fears and terrible imaginations become quite absurd. But why should the Forum permit such fantasies to be broadcast in its pages? Its declared policy is to furnish an arena for the debating of important subjects. How can you debate when fantasies are gravely stated as facts? We would be very sorry to think that Mr. Orebaugh's views are really those of any considerable number of people. What a world of nightmare!

The Foreign Policy Association will soon issue a report on the Roman question which is a model of good journalism. We hope that both the Forum and Mr. Orebaugh are on the mailing list of the Foreign Policy Association.

WEEK BY WEEK

GRATEFUL though one must be for the news that Church and state in Mexico have reached an accord, it is imperative to adjudge what has been accomplished realistically and impartially. The object was to establish a modus vivendi through which restoration of the religious ministry could be attained, and the virulence of the "Catholic revolt" appeased. Priests may now return to their congregations, Mass may be said, doctrine may be expounded from the pulpit. It is more than pathetic to observe the consequent rejoicing of the nation, which found expression in one of the largest pilgrimages known to history. Here is sufficient proof, if that were needed, of the crime which has disgraced the world during more than three years, and which has been so flagrantly disregarded in this country by those who would ordinarily be most expected to champion the cause of justice.

Maneuvering for Mexican Peace

MEANWHILE one must note that none of the major issues has been met. Religious liberty, religious instruction, religious peace—these are still out of reach, and no prophet is bold enough to declare that they will be attained soon. Doubtless, however, the willingness of the Vatican to underwrite the existing agreement implies a belief that further progress can be made chiefly through the instrumentality of the United States. Though the moment for definitive comment has not yet come, one is permitted to suppose that the Holy See has, in a measure, adopted a point of view phrased long ago by the title of a Commonweal editorial: "Have faith in Morrow." The most discouraging aspect of the situation is the continued unwillingness of agencies of public opinion to countenance realities. Thus we find the New York Times opining editorially that "registration" is the main issue. For some reason or other, the country cannot be brought to look at Mexico even through a periscope. To anybody who believes in the remedial power of enlightened and generous public opinion, its total eclipse in this particular instance must seem ominous and unfortunate.

EVERYBODY at the Pilgrim Dinner had a good time, including the non-Anglo-American diplomats. Mr. Dawes made four points with commendable skill and thoroughness: that the time has come to insist upon armament reductions as a first step toward the achievement of peace; that any agreements which may be arrived at "should have not partial but world sanction"; that the naval expert is an excellent professional person but a source of confusion to the statesman; and that equitable naval realignments ought to be expressed in clear terms which the "man in the street" can understand without

Another Love Feast

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the help of a glossary. Upon all this worthy diction, which included a dig at the unrestrained pacifist and the incorrigible militarist, Premier MacDonald beamed as warmly as ever the sun has beamed these days. He referred very frankly to pre-election promises: "I have made it clear both before and during the campaign that I put relations with the United States in the forefront of our national concerns. As regards them, we have not let the grass grow under our feet." He waxed poetic over his first meeting with Ambassador Dawes: "Symbolizing the openness of our hearts and our purposes, sunshine poured through the windows of the great room in which we sat, and with it came the song of birds." Nevertheless he was mindful of the weather on previous occasions: "There are obstacles to be surmounted, differing interests to be reconciled, some historical inheritances to be soothed, and rivalries which are legitimate to be confined to their proper channels." Well, one hopes earnestly that the sunshine will continue to pour and that the birds will never join a musicians' union.

The Opinions of Poincaré

AMERICAN students of world business will be grateful to Foreign Affairs for securing and publishing an article by Prime Minister Poincaré, summarizing frankly his impression of the contemporary international situation. The work done to promote agreement between nations—the League of Nations, the World Court, the Kellogg treaties, the report of the Experts' Committee—is seen as promising to "create a new atmosphere in Europe." France may rightly be proud of its share in this achievement, we are told, and attention is called to the gradual reduction of the term of military service, to the financial sacrifices made by millions of people, and to the resolve not to seek territorial aggrandizement. M. Poincaré sees the gravest danger to peace in the status of territorial arrangements made at the close of the war, when "national minorities" were the vogue. Any attempt to revise these arrangements would be "fatal to peace," and several countries are actually thinking of such attempts. "Hungary is conducting a campaign to get back those districts assigned to her neighbors. A permanent state of conflict exists between Poland and Lithuania. Russia wishes to modify her Polish frontiers and to take Bessarabia from Roumania." Still more perilous, however, are the Austrian desire to seek Anschluss to Germany, and this last country's deep dissatisfaction with what has been done with the Dantzig corridor.

POINCARE'S analysis is, no doubt, correct. Obviously it will be found much easier to regulate the financial and armament problems bequeathed by the war than to effect a completely satisfactory settlement of territorial difficulties. Anyone can say that the "national minorities" principle was wrong; but having once been applied, it can be repudiated again only at the cost of a veritable uproar. This can be understood best by drawing a parallel with possible situations in United States foreign affairs. Nothing in the world could be harder to secure than Philippine independence; and Haiti has caused us more trouble than the tariff. It would be simpler to buy up every vestige of Mexican territory for financial interests than to annex a square foot of worthless Sonora soil. Nevertheless, since necessity is the mother of invention, some way must be found of assuring to Austria the mere ability to exist, and of straightening out the mess that has been made of the Dantzig corridor. One might even argue that it is more important to appoint international commissions to study these two sore spots on the body politic than to attempt to halt further increases in naval armament.

We All Deplore Them

"I DEEPLY deplore the killing of any person," declared Mr. Hoover in a statement commenting upon recent prohibition shootings and assuring the public that any case of ordnance misuse would be investigated by the proper authorities. We have now really come to a point where a proclamation by the President that he is without homicidal inclinations becomes significant. It differentiates him at once from diverse eminent Methodist clergymen, and it is not without a suggestion that restraining influences will be injected into Mr. Lowman's brigade. Still more interesting is the rest of Mr. Hoover's comment: "I hope that the communities along the border will do their best to help the Treasury in the systematic war that is being carried on by international criminals against the laws of the United States. It is these activities that are at the root of all our difficulties." One may be pardoned for noticing that this observation is not a little like a line in Mr. Chesterton's poem —"that which was our trouble comes again out of the West." Thus surmised Mohammed in the olden days, observing that Spain still had a navy. At present, in view of the circumstance that the citizenry keeps up its willingness to pay a good price for contraband Bourbon, it is really imperative to advise the citizenry to restrain itself.

More Sighs from the Donkey

COMMENT on the recent Democratic party dinner in Washington continues to be generally mournful in tone. To many it is evident that harmony was not effected either among the diverse groups which have supported the Jefferson-Jackson-Wilson program, or among the varieties of interpretation which have been given to that program. Mr. Raskob did not pose as a new political oracle, but merely as a manager aware of the practical difficulties which campaigning has latterly involved. He would like to develop efficient, well-lubricated machinery. He might venture a timid suggestion that a few shibboleths, once rather helpful, annoy a considerable

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

number of citizens nowadays. And the result? A frightened inquiry, on the part of not a few Democrats, as to what is happening to principle. Where is the "core of idealism," where the fervent convictions, which once animated the party? It is a pertinent question which we hope will be answered, because the great majority of contemporary Democratic sages are uninspiring enough. But to expect the answer from the manager—thrown in, as it were, with a solid financial contribution—is to be really quite optimistic. The prize for guessing must go, however, to the New York Evening Post, for publishing an article on Mr. Raskob's wage-earner's savings scheme by Mr. Byron Darnton. According to this acute analyst, if workers respond to this appeal to the extent predicted, there "will be concentrated in this little man sufficient power to make him almost a despot." For the "billions of dollars" which poor people now throw away must inevitably result in a world's champion financial force that will endow its superintendent with all the votes he wants. We refer those who entertain doubts regarding the Democratic future to that eminent soothsayer, Mr. Darnton.

THE question of college standards in a democracy is broached in a recent interview given to the New York World by Franklin H. Giddings, professor emeritus of sociology at Columbia University. No one could feel, after reading this veteran educator's opinions, that he takes a rosy view of the subject; but the thought occurs that perhaps even his grim statement that the masses are being over-educated, to their detriment and the world's, may fall short as a diagnosis of the real difficulty. The urge among mediocrities and morons for a higher education Dr. Giddings believes to be social: "Notice, recognition, compensations for inferiorities and balms for complexes must be had at any cost. . . . The substance of education, as they conceive it, is a mysterious medicine, bringing not knowledge or skill but gentility. . . ." This is true, beyond controversy, but there is a more perplexing truth behind. The urge for spurious gentility is the universal phenomenon of our present life. It symbolizes itself in the silk stockings and imitation furs of the shop girl, the expensive radio of the laborer, the country club of the small suburbanite, just as definitely as in the superstitious pursuit of a higher education by the class whom Dr. Giddings denominates as "intellectual dead beats." But, though its manifestations are social, its root is probably not, in the narrow sense, social: it is rather to be found in that piece of political metaphysic which tells us, in varying phraseology but with dogmatic explicitness, that all men are created equal and have certain inalianable rights—and so on.

Of Democratic Education

SO LONG as this doctrine is fed to the masses of men, so long will they try to make it good upon those material levels which—according to the limits of their intelligence and culture—they understand and care for. This is not intended as a piece of deploring. We accept the fact of modern society's commitment to the egalitarian creed, and feel that the dangers of its affirmation are at least less than the dangers of its denial. We merely recognize clearly what the dangers of its affirmation are. It is characteristic of man, at least of western man, to make his abstractions concrete. If this process of translation tends to be fixed on vulgar levels among us, the fault is not so much that of the vulgar minds as of the superior minds: the minds which should lead, illumine, define, and which fail in such large numbers to do so. In a working and balanced society, the corollary of the almost purely mystical doctrine of the equality of all kinds of men is the equality, in necessity and worth, of all kinds of labor, the equality, in dignity and responsibility, of all classes of society. And this is a corollary which the unled and unillumined will never supply, no matter how pointedly they are referred to as hewers of wood and drawers of water. It is a corollary which must be built slowly and painfully into our traditions by those whose vision is broad enough to see its need and whose minds are distinguished enough really to believe it.

A DESPATCH from Bucharest to the New York Times details a tragedy which is so weirdly complete that it inevitably suggests caricature. Stephen Leacock, in his moments of happier fooling, has written parody sequences in which death follows death with the grisly precision exhibited in the case of this Roumanian family. The young son—so runs the news item—threw the family funds into the fire; the father, enraged, killed him; the mother, distracted by his cries, left her year-old infant to drown in the bath tub, and upon discovering this second death, drowned herself in a pond; whereupon her husband killed himself with a revolver. It is impossible not to meet this recital with the disconcerted laugh whereby we mark our recognition of incongruity or excess. Yet it is obviously the sort of case which demonstrates that our prized sense of humor is no infallible gauge of values or proportions. Death is death, though four times multiplied. Loss, rage and despair do not cease to be their devastating selves though confined within the incredibly neat pattern of a single domestic débâcle. On the whole, such happenings give one a deepened respect for those realists who keep their sense of the ridiculous strictly in abeyance—for certain of the Russians, and most of all, for Hardy. These men know how to pile tragedy on tragedy with an unsophisticated and childlike gravity before which the most robust laughter finally trails into uneasy silence. They have learned from life itself how irrelevant and artificial can be those forms which the comic spirit imposes.

Tragedy in Roumania

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IT CAN be conceived that the Democrats are pleased with the legislative accomplishments of the minority party in the Senate during the special session now interrupted for recess, but most observers would expect that pleasure to be as secret as possible. For surely there is no room for pride in tactics which have been employed solely for the purpose of showing up the Republicans. Considering this policy, Senator Robinson is correct when he declares "the Democrats in the Senate are almost equally united." "They have," according to Senator McKellar, who harmonizes his voice of eulogy with that of Mr. Robinson's, "in the interest of the farmers, forced a vote, in both houses, on the debenture plan showing the unwillingness of the Republican majority to carry out the farm relief plank of their national platform." The country, then, must have been viciously deceived into believing that it was Mr. Hoover who forced the House vote on the debenture plan. It also must have misunderstood the high goodwill of Democratic senators toward the farmer when they united with the "progressives" to make the President swallow debentures or go without a farm relief measure. Of course the Democrats have been united. But before intelligent thinkers will wreathe them with laurel they must show that their union is for constructive party politics. Such proof will be eagerly welcomed by all who recognize the need and value of an intelligent and vigilant minority.

For What United?

GENEALOGY still remains an absorbing subject. Even Darwin could not disturb its study by his curious belief that if a man climbed his family tree too high he would find a monkey grinning at him. So the recently published Your Family Tree, which comes out with the startling information that Calvin Coolidge can trace his ancestry back to Charlemagne, John D. Rockefeller to Henry I of France, and Secretary Wilbur to David I of Scotland, will doubtless find its own peculiar market. However, the author's readiness and aptitude to discover crowned ancestors reminds us too forcibly of Mark Twain's magician in the Connecticut Yankee. He held his hearers spellbound by treating them to succulent details of what the emperor of China was doing at that very moment. Or the king of Spain. Or the queen of Sardinia. He was safe as long as there was no possibility of verification, but failed miserably on Alfred, who was represented as resting at Camelot when he was actually traveling toward the magician. Mark Twain, too, was interested in ancestors but became a mite discouraged when he found that his family tree looked uncommonly like a gibbet. We have always suffered a check in any inclination to go adventuring among our sires by giving thought to a trenchant and wise professor who thus addressed a classmate descended from Carroll of Carrollton: "You may have sprung from Carroll but the trouble with you is that you sprang too far."

Those Family Trees

UNUSUAL interest attaches to the Mass which was said recently on Goat Island, close to the roar of Niagara, in commemoration of Father Louis Hennepin's sojourn near the falls, which he was the first to describe in detail. The service as a whole was broadcast over a nation-wide hookup, so that everyone who cared to could find out what the central act of Christian worship really is and meditate upon Bishop Turner's dignified plea for a fair hearing. After referring to those who question the Catholic's right to live in this country, the Bishop associated the event of the hour with "the advent of the first discoverer of America." "Columbus and Hennepin gave, as we are giving here," he said, "the expression of their deep religious feeling in the language of the oldest of the Christian churches in the Te Deum and the Mass of the liturgy." Who can doubt that Hennepin would have found it exceedingly difficult to understand the kind of religious bickering which has been rampant among us lately? Intrigue and backbiting he, poor man, understood well enough. He even indulged in both himself, to some extent. But he would have regarded it as incredible that a nation which had established religious liberty by law, precedent and tradition should have grown so restive in the presence of its own sterling achievement.

Mass at Niagara

AMATEUR theatricals, like back-lot baseball, are important criteria of civilization. If the essence of drama be "impersonation," how can one grow social at all without developing the habit of creating a personality for display? Thence it is only a step to giving expression to the character of the group to which one belongs; and that is certainly one major function of the stage. Because the parish is a group, and potentially an ideal one, it is odd enough that the opportunity to foster play-acting is so seldom grasped. A recent evening's entertainment provided by Our Lady of Lourdes Dramatic Society, New York City, amply demonstrated how much can be done. Talented young people—including a few whose youth is now only of the heart—shared in presenting a medley of comedy and drama which reflected an admirable spirit and approximated so closely to professional standards that the spectators might well have believed themselves on Broadway. We saw a worthy point in the fact that one play, a realistic character comedy by George Kelly, argued so amiably for friendship between the church and the theatre. Wisely enough the Society did not strain these so desirable relations by devoting itself to a series of purely pious plays. Its emphasis upon wholesome entertainment competently afforded was both pleasant and memorable.

Drama within Reach

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THOSE VERY DARK AGES

WHEN the Mediaeval Academy of America was established some few years ago, hardly anybody imagined that it could do more than provide an excuse for annual friendly gatherings of people who can read illuminated manuscripts. Nor were the early numbers of Speculum very reassuring. Professor Rand did what he could to liven up the paper, but an editor picking his way between hastily written book reviews and undigested research articles might just as well try to be the captain of a skiff attempting a passage between the proverbial rocks off Sicily. But so rightly directed was the step which had been taken that now, reviewing the evidence of activity presented at the last meeting, one believes the Academy to be one of the most virile and original among existing "learned societies." Mediaevalism, in all its aspects, has made a profound impression upon thinking America.

The annual report of the clerk testified to both progress in enlisting memberships and to successful research. Perhaps the most notable single endeavor has been the excavation of the ruined abbey church of Cluny, in Burgundy. Professor Kenneth J. Conant, director of the work, has so far been able to uncover both a beautiful narthex portal and sufficient dimensional data to make possible a restoration of the façade. From a study of extant sculptural remains, Mr. Conant has also been able to establish their date as approximately 1100 A.D., so that valuable new light is thrown upon the development of French Romanesque art. It is believed that the full significance of Cluny as a model of ecclesiastical architecture will ultimately be revealed, and of course the excavated ruins have already acquired the dignity of a monument historique. The Mediaeval Academy raised a fund to defray the cost, and also secured the good offices of the late Ambassador Herrick in approaching the French government. Articles setting forth the progress of the venture are now running in Speculum. They amply deserve, we think, the attention of mediaevalists and art students.

Other interesting projects have been inaugurated. The first book issued under the auspices of the Academy was Professor Lane Cooper's edition of Boethius. Other volumes announced for publication, or in preparation, include Professor Roy Deferrari's translation of Hugo of Saint Victor's De Sacramentis; Professor Edward Kennard Rand's Manuscripts of Tours; and Professor Charles Beeson's facsimile edition of an early Cicero manuscript. Even more notable, possibly, is the increase of the Academy's contribution to the work of the Bollandists—an endeavor vitally aided by American generosity. Finally the preparation of measured drawings of the cathedral of Palma, Majorca, has been nearly completed.

All these are achievements which have, in a measure, been delegated by the Academy to members, students or kindred groups. The annual meeting itself may be described as a collective endeavor. We have already reported, in a previous issue, Professor Karl Young's masterly summary of what has been learned regarding mediaeval drama. Mr. Conant reported the findings of the Cluny expedition, stressing in particular the capitals which seem to form so vital a link in the history of French architectural sculpture. Professor Rand discussed, in his pleasant and constantly illuminating way, the status of the classics in thirteenth-century education. It may be learned from contemporary records, he declared, that the vogue of Latin authors and commentators did not diminish during the period. One list of authors studied is "a little mirror of that Christian humanism which had not ceased to color the mediaeval mind at the time when that mind was preëminently occupied with conquering each last corner on the realm of thought." Perhaps, indeed, the schools of philosophy, law and medicine were really "graduate schools" which presupposed a training in the liberal arts.

"Neither Dante nor his readers," concluded Professor Rand, "conceived that he had put out of commission that buon maestro who had inspired his bello stile. The eminence of the ancients was brighter, not more obscure, for their use by the creators of a literary art that, as we view it, deserves its own place among the classics of all time. The outcome of it all is not that the thirteenth century saw ancient letters engulfed in the passion for dialectics, but that in the various ways above described the influence of the classics grew steadily broader and deeper. The thirteenth century had a rich and varied culture in which, though new and old engaged in mighty conflict, the new did not banish the old but drew from it, as ever, part of its own strength for progress."

These words, which make their point thoughtfully enough, indicate both the spirit of the Academy and the limitations which it has assigned to its endeavor. The mediaeval period is seen as an era when the central concerns of a cultivated intellect were honored as highly as they have ever been in human history. We turn to it therefore not as to something dark or arid, but to a place where we shall find conserved the true image of man—reasonable, noble, courteous and scholarly. Though the fringes of society may well have been fairly barbarous in centuries when the pagan forests still hedged in the "central sea," the labor of conserving the gleam of civilization is only so much the more lustrous. The Academy, however, is essentially humanistic in outlook. It has not busied itself with those philosophical and religious convictions which were the keystones of the middle-ages, and probably will not do so. Here one comes upon a distinctly Catholic realm, which must very likely remain closed, in a measure, to all who have not actually entered the Church. Accordingly one concludes that hand in hand with an enthusiastic appreciation of what has been accomplished at Cambridge, there must go a sturdy resolution to accomplish the task remaining.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SPHINX COMMISSION

By WILLIAM C. MURPHY, JR.

The personnel of the National Law Enforcement Commission is distinguished and evocative of confidence. But what is the Commission for? Mr. Murphy affords no answer, in the following paper, to this question. Indeed he believes that the membership itself is in the dark, no exit out of which is indicated by the President's remarks on the subject. A survey of these last adds not a little to the interest of the problem. It does, however, reveal something of the legalistic quandary in which the nation finds itself, and the inevitable association of the problem with prohibition.—The Editors.

WASHINGTON has grown exceedingly cynical on the subject of special governmental commissions. Many such bodies have come into existence and passed away in recent years, leaving behind them voluminous unread reports and recommendations, together with as many unsolved problems as these various bodies were created to discuss. The establishment of a special commission to investigate or consider some great question of the hour is a tried and reliable device which makes it possible for an administration to offer the appearance of great activity without making any definite decision. At least nine times out of ten, when a body of this nature is called into existence the conclusions it will reach, if any, may be predicted quite accurately from the moment its personnel is announced. It is equally true that nine times out of ten, when these conclusions and recommendations have been announced with all proper solemnity, that is the end of the subject. A special commission, generally speaking, has served its purpose when it has heard a subject to death; when the public becomes weary of reading accounts of its proceedings, the commission then makes the report it was created to make and the subject is dropped.

But the National Law Enforcement Commission is in a very different category from most of its predecessors. As a matter of fact, this Commission is the greatest enigma Washington has had since Mr. Coolidge issued his famous "I do not choose to run" statement from the Black Hills. The present enigma is just as impenetrable as the former and seems destined to longer life. Unorthodox though it seems, there is reason to believe that even the members of the Commission do not know just exactly what they are supposed to do.

Opinions as to the real meaning of the Law Enforcement Commission range from the view that it is nothing more than a sop to the whirling dervish element among the drys who aided in Mr. Hoover's election, to the theory that it is prologue to a political maneuver of truly Machiavellian cunning.

However, there does seem to be agreement on one point; perhaps that should be stated first. It is that Mr. Hoover has failed to convince the public that the Commission is not something connected primarily with prohibition. All of Mr. Hoover's efforts and all of the statements to the effect that the Commission is to deal with the problem of better enforcement of all laws have not made a dent in the public's conception that it is essentially a prohibition question. There is no need to go further than the public expressions voiced by leaders in all walks of life when the personnel of the Commission was announced; with practical unanimity their statements revealed that they were thinking of the work of the Commission in terms of wet and dry.

There is good reason for this seeming stubbornness. When President Hoover first suggested the idea which has developed into the Law Enforcement Commission, he did so during a discussion of prohibition. This was in his address accepting the Republican nomination, delivered in the Stanford University Stadium on August 11, 1928. Reiterating his reference to the "great social and economic experiment, noble in motive and far-reaching in purpose," he said:

> Common sense compels us to realize that grave abuses have occurred—abuses which must be remedied. An organized, searching investigation of fact and causes can alone determine the wise method of correcting them.

This suggestion of an "organized, searching investigation" was expanded by the Republican campaign orators as Mr. Hoover's alternative to the modificationist views of Governor Smith. In the dry states, Mr. Hoover's proposal was construed as an investigation to ascertain more effective methods of enforcing the Volstead Act in all its verbatim sanctity; in the wet areas it was held out as a lure to the thirsty and construed as meaning that Mr. Hoover was not entirely sure that the Eighteenth Amendment is an improved substitute for the Ten Commandments. It was suggested that what the Republican candidate really had in mind was an investigation to determine whether prohibition itself is wise or unwise. Whatever meaning Mr. Hoover may have intended to convey in his acceptance speech, the public from that date until Inauguration Day thought in terms of a commission having to do with prohibition.

In his inaugural address, although placing his references to the proposed commission immediately after his discussion of enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment, the President sounded a different note:

> I propose to appoint a national commission for a searching investigation of the whole structure of our federal system of jurisprudence, to include the method of enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment and the causes of abuse under it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This proposal, of course, was somewhat broader than the suggestion of "an organized, searching investigation of fact and causes" for the purpose of "correcting" the "grave abuses" in enforcement of the prohibition laws. Thereby hangs the reason for much mystification in Washington at present.

There is one school of thought whose practitioners do not flatter the President's sincerity by holding that Mr. Hoover, having used the idea of a prohibition investigating commission for campaign purposes, now seeks to spread the work of the Commission over so much territory that its original objective will be forgotten before it completes its duties. Needless to say, this is the theory of the practical politicians who sang dry in the South and West, and wet in the East during the recent compaign. They know what they would do in the President's place and assume he is doing likewise.

In what may be called the second group of theorizers are those who profess to believe that the President is an ardent prohibitionist and that his sole idea in appointing the Commission was to seek ways and means of making the Volstead Act thoroughly effective. They point out that in his acceptance speech he declared:

> I do not favor the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. I stand for the efficient enforcement of the laws enacted thereunder. . . .
>
> Modification of the enforcement laws which would permit that which the constitution forbids is nullification.

Furthermore, in his inaugural address the President, while discussing the Eighteenth Amendment, said:

> I have been selected by you to execute and enforce the laws of the country. I propose to do so to the extent of my own abilities, but the measure of success that the government shall attain will depend upon the moral support which you, as citizens, extend.

This view is held by such men as Senator Jones of Washington—of "five and ten" law fame—who introduced a resolution proposing the creation of a committee to investigate prohibition enforcement. The Senator said that he thought such a committee would meet the requirements which the President had in mind and, naively explained that he thought all members of the committee should be ardent prohibitionists. But Senator Jones decided not to press his resolution after he had conferred with the then President-elect.

Senator Borah of Idaho, who shared honors with Mrs. Willebrandt in the Hoover oratorical campaign, apparently has the same view. Writing in Collier's of June 8, Senator Borah says:

> The real problem is: what effect shall we as a people, as a nation, give to the law because it is the law? . . . This problem the President has assigned himself the task of solving if it is possible to do so.

It is in this same article that the Senator takes the opponents of prohibition to task by saying:

> But the dissatisfied [with the prohibition law] present no program. They offer no alternative. They denounce the law, decry its advocates, embarrass those who would enforce it.

Thus calmly does the Senator ignore the very specific modification program advocated by Governor Smith during the last campaign. Thus does he demonstrate that to him the aim of the present Commission is to devise means of enforcing the present prohibition laws and not to consider the merits or demerits of the laws themselves.

But there is still a third body of opinion as to the meaning of the President's new Commission. Its theory has the merit, at least of being ambitious. To put it bluntly, the theory of this third group is that the President really wants to find out whether or not prohibition is workable, whether or not there is any substantial trend of public opinion against the present law. The assumption, of course, is that the answers he obtains to these questions will determine his recommendations to Congress, and, perhaps, his own attitude should he seek reëlection in 1932. It is a large-scale theory, to be sure, but its proponents are not lacking in plausibility. For instance, it is pointed out that if Mr. Hoover was merely trying to side-track the idea of a prohibition commission, he could have done so by appointing a commission composed of obscure persons who would have their brief day in the spotlight of publicity and then pass on their way. The calibre of the Commission he appointed rather discredits this idea.

Furthermore, it is suggested that if all Mr. Hoover wants to do is to make enforcement more effective under the present laws, he has no need for a national commission. He could call together the officials charged with enforcement, ask them what machinery they need, and then ask Congress for the appropriations to provide the machinery. So the alluring conclusion is reached, in the minds of this last-named group, that Mr. Hoover has some deep-laid plan in mind which may result in rather startling consequences. It should be mentioned that this view is held, for the most part, by those who are not altogether satisfied with the present dry laws. Possibly their preferences may have some effect upon their judgment.

Proud White Waves

The ocean heaps its thunder upon the sand,
While combers, preening their bright disdain to the shore,
Combers crested with languor, poise toward the land,
Like proud white swans, arching over the roar.

Proud white waves interrogate not the sea,
Lest—too much aware of the hour they are the heart of—
They cannot exult in their leashed, white liberty
Nor feel the lavish power they are a part of!

LOUIS GINSBERG.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MUSIC IN FRANCE AND GERMANY

By KARL SCHAEZLER

SINCE music is less able than its sister arts to express plastic ideas, the value of the information it supplies to cultural and spiritual history, or even to criticism of the contemporary mind, is generally ignored. But the extent to which it can reflect the individuality of a nation, a culture, a time spirit, is shown clearly in the development of French and German music during the past eighty years. Here are expressed not only the characteristic differences existing between two peoples, but also (in what the two tendencies share in common) that unity inside the European plurality which is not completely submerged even today, and of which the citizen of the continent is often less aware than are residents of other parts of the world.

The German artist, manifesting in his good work no less than in his bad a deep inwardness and a disposition to dream, is inclined to be romantic and, in a measure, to neglect strict form for the sake of content and expression. To the French artist on the other hand, clarity and architectonic structure are more important than all else, and formal harmony and therefore classicism more natural. Now, if I may credit a letter received from Romain Rolland, France was "musically poor" during the nineteenth century, while Germany possessed a towering genius in Richard Wagner. Views of the world are not considered articles of export, but this case of Wagner is proof to the contrary. He dominated French musical life during whole decades as completely as he did German musical life; and there is no doubt that his work is the artistic expression of a definite Weltanschauung. Accordingly, more than art was involved in the circumstance that reaction from Wagner came more quickly and forcefully in France than among us in Germany. Instrumental musicians as original as Anton Bruckner and Hugo Wolf could not escape Wagnerian influence, and Brahms, whose work is usually held to be at the opposite pole from Wagner's, is nevertheless an out-and-out romantic in his own way. Romanticism, and in particular the romanticism of the Bayreuth master, is accordingly imprinted upon German opera not merely until the time of Richard Strauss's first attempts at dramatic composition, but even as late as the most recent work of Hans Pfitzner, the second among the three greatest German composers to have appeared thus far in the twentieth century. In the realm of symphonic poetry and of song writing (so essential a part of German music) conditions are quite similar. Max Reger, the third of our three outstanding contemporaries, kept resolutely aloof, it is true, from the Wagnerian style. His ideal has been strict polyphony, the contrapuntal style; yet even he has never proceeded in such conscious repudiation of Wagner as did those French composers who began to write when he did.

It is significant enough that a similarly important rôle was given to polyphonic music—and to a historic form of it, the Palestrina style—during the course of the French reaction from Wagner. And when one sees that side by side with this the Gregorian choral once again attained to importance (the Schola Cantorum was founded in Paris during 1894) one can guess how deeply this traditionally Catholic, century-old, cultural treasure must have been embedded in the French spirit in order that a then so old-fashioned melodic form should have cropped out between forms so different in character from it as Wagnerianism and impressionism. It was Claude Debussy who helped impressionism to victory with his opera, Pelléas et Mélisande. This constituted a reaction from Wagner in so far as Debussy, basing his effort on the aesthetic sensualism of his race, sought to liberate music of all literary and philosophic pretensions and so to reach a position basically different from romanticism. His art is distinguished for opalescent blending of the subtlest tints, for mellow twilight, and for exquisite sensitiveness. To the German taste, however, it seemed to contain something purposively evanescent and passive; and so it never really found a home in Germany where the public lacked ability to understand it.

Nevertheless impressionism did make an entry into German music. With this tendency one must associate Richard Strauss, the third of our leading contemporary composers. He too refined form to the ultimate degree, and even over-sharpened it. We must observe that he, of the three, was destined to exert the greatest influence upon foreign countries, including France. Yet though, owing to his incomparable mastery of form, he affected the future more strongly than did Debussy, it seems at present that the trend of events has hastened beyond him too. I am speaking here of Strauss not only as an individual instance, in so far as his power of creative invention seems to have flagged since (let us say) Die Frau ohne Schatten, but also of Strauss as the representative and sponsor of a tendency. For he and Debussy had, apparently, discovered so much promising virgin territory that there could be no dearth of imitators, gifted and otherwise —in Germany Erich Korngold and Franz Schreker, for example; in France Maurice Ravel and Eric Satie. These have, in part, gone close to the limit of the possibilities latent in the tendency they espoused, and so have themselves rendered necessary a change, the imminence of which was indicated by the curious irony which not infrequently comes to the fore in Ravel himself and most noticeably in Satie. The manner in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which this change then took place is an aspect of the most interesting part of this entire historical development.

In the work of the impressionists, the French missed in particular clarity and translucency of form; to the Germans these were not so imperatively necessary. The turning-point therefore came even prior to the war in France, but in Germany followed that war. In the case of France the incentive came, once again, from a foreign source, and indeed—as the French fondness for the ballet renders easily understandable—from the Russian ballet. The première of Igor Stravinsky's Sacre du Printemps (Paris, 1913) was an epochal event. What fascinated the French was primarily the elemental simplicity of the rhythm and the wild natural force in which this music differed so profoundly from the spiritualized artistry and supersensitiveness of Debussy. Something still more fundamental, however, came to the surface here: a discarding of the speculations of subjectivism and an acknowledgment of the evidence for objectivity. Naturally this new music was a form of expression having only temporary significance for the French ear, which would inevitably find it somewhat barbaric in the end. But "inter arma silent musae"; and so this final evolution progressed slowly into the years of restoration which followed the war. Upon it, as is worthy of notice in this connection, one of the outspokenly Catholic poets, Jean Cocteau, exerted a strong influence. The leading sponsors, however, were the "group of six," the spirit animating whom has been most happily expressed by Georges Auric and Francis Poulenc. Darius Milhaud has a preference for a really very radical polyphony. Then Arthur Honegger, Swiss in origin, portrayed the chugging of a locomotive symphonically in Pacific 231 and ultimately quite abandoned the principles of the group. These culminate in a demand for simplicity of form; with this is associated the suppression of chromatic harmony, to replace which a diatonic harmony is proposed; and, finally, the purging of emphasis and all romanticism generally is advocated.

But this romanticism, in company with impressionism, dominated music in Germany virtually without challenge until after the war. This period, the terrible hour of awakening from dreams, destroyed so many true and false ideals that a violent attack upon all idealism and upon an art remote from reality was then inevitable. Impressionism, for its part, was quite as remote from life. It had become the caviar of epicures. And so there followed a plunge into tonal asceticism and abstraction, as in the musical technic of Arnold Schönberg and his pupils. The more general and important reaction comprised, however, a surrender of all traditional forms, a repudiation of all tonality, the "atonalism" of the musical Bolsheviks. Since lost wars are frequently trailed by revolutions, it is not surprising that so tremendous a catastrophe as was experienced by the German people in 1918 should have meant the unleashing of all the energies which were struggling to move forward. The admission into the orchestra of such "musical instruments" as the siren, the klaxon, the merry-go-round gong and the rattle was sufficient demonstration that all was now permitted. Paul Hindemith as well as Ernst Krenek were, originally, anarchists of this type. The first turned, however, to a highly valuable, firmly controlled endeavor and is rightly considered a notable factor in very recent German musical activity. He and a group of artists animated by similar convictions compose in the spirit of an entirely new polyphony, and therefore in the spirit of an objective and organic form.

Krenek, however, is still disposed to caper. Americans have been given the opportunity to form an opinion of Jonny Spielt Auf, the jazz opera which is his best-known work; and I remember that The Commonweal commented upon it at length. This Jonny was played many times in all parts of Germany amid enthusiastic applause and bitter denunciation; in Paris it was, relatively speaking, a fiasco. (Meanwhile this opera has been superseded by another equally hotly contested piece, for which a travesty of John Gay's familiar Beggar's Opera supplied the libretto—a composition radical in every respect, which was purposely served up in Leipzig on Christmas Day!) Here the question of the influence of jazz upon art music had already been touched upon. So far as I am able to judge, this influence has been nil in France; but attempts to make jazz serve high art have not been infrequent, though hotly debated, in Germany. A highly respected conservatory (Frankfurt) even sought to establish its own school of jazz, thereby raising a storm of indignation. Very likely jazz is too remote from us ever to render possible a final synthesis, however fruitful it may eventually prove to rhythm.

As yet everything is manifestly in a process of formation. It is therefore unavoidable that in so brief a survey as this paper attempts to make, a large group of less important incidents must remain unnoticed in order that the major aspects of the situation may become, in a measure, clear. And so we reach an interesting conclusion: in France the work of clarification seems to have progressed relatively farther (it was there aided by the genius loci and external circumstances); in Germany movement and ferment are still stronger, but a certain settling—yes, even an effort to establish a new classicism—is now a not negligible factor in its musical life. Thus music in both countries is moving toward related goals, and even the developments themselves have more in common than is apparent at first sight. The compass readings are the same in both cases: repudiation of the subjectivism of the nineteenth century as that was couched in an over-refined harmony, and so also of the tendency to emphasize feeling too strongly; on the other hand, a turning to more objective, more

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

generally valid forms, in particular to counterpoint and polyphony, the renewed attractiveness of which is indicated also in the contemporary Bach renaissance.

It is true that our time needs a new polyphony, and this could not as yet have crystallized to the point where it constituted so nicely adjusted a system as that of old classical music. We are in the midst of a period of transition, but its unsatisfactory characteristics must not lead us to forget or minimize the ideal striven for. Then too, even those who take no heed of the basis supplied to all polyphonic music as such by views of the world, can hardly fail to discern here something like an approach, even though it be as yet a quite remote and timid approach, to the Thomistic and so also to the Catholic ideal of art. The coincidence of this development with the revival of Thomistic philosophy is of course no accident. Both are symptomatic of the fact that our time, pagan though it may seem at first sight, conceals certain inclinations toward Catholicism which might flower into fruit if they ended in Catholicism. If then music has been able to bring us to such trends of thought it is because this music is, on the one hand, the most fervent of the arts excepting poetry and so feels the nearness to or remoteness from God that characterizes an epoch, and on the other hand remains, when genuine at all, necessarily a genuine child of its own particular age.

NATIONAL ORIGINS IN PENNSYLVANIA

By FRANK RAHILL

PRESIDENT HOOVER has failed in his efforts to secure a further postponement of the application of the provision in the Immigration Act of 1924 calling for the substitution of the census of 1890 for that of 1910 as a basis for computing "national origins." Accordingly, this drastic and frankly discriminatory provision becomes part of the law on July 1, committing us as a nation to racial selection—or rather rejection—within the white race as a method of choosing new population.

Appropriately enough, it was a senator from Pennsylvania who effectually blocked a reconsideration of this vexing question of national origins in the current extraordinary session of Congress. Whatever its immediate inspiration—a question that puzzles political observers—Senator David A. Reed's attitude is in line with a long-standing tradition in the commonwealth he represents. Penn's colony, founded expressly as "an asylum for the oppressed of all nations," by a curious irony, early became a hotbed of antialien sentiment and long remained such, in spite of the heterogeneous composition of its population and in the face of the substantial debt it owes to the enterprise and industry, the brains and the brawn of successive waves of immigration.

In phrases strikingly like those employed by exclusionists today, Governor Patrick Gordon back in 1727, was viewing with alarm the wholesale immigration of Germans occurring at that time. He expressed his concern for the peace and security of the province, which "might be endangered by such numbers of strangers daily pouring in, who, being ignorant of our language and laws, make, as it were, a distinct people from His Majesty's subjects." These new arrivals were rendered particularly obnoxious by the circumstance, noted by Logan, that there were "divers Papists among them."

The governor and the assembly, chronically at odds, found themselves for once in substantial agreement, and a law was passed in 1729 which may be regarded as one of the ancestors of American immigration-restriction legislation based on race discrimination. It imposed a head tax of forty shillings on all foreigners (non-English, that is) admitted to the colony. The law was short-lived and had scant effect, but it is significant of the strength of the sentiment in those early days.

The immediate occasion of Gordon's alarm was the arrival of 109 Palatines, one of the numerous groups of Germans who followed Pastorius to Penn's land—Philadelphia being a main port of entry. Certainly they seem to have been harmless enough. There is ample testimony to their industry, thrift, tractability. Yet apprehension on their account persisted, with nothing more formidable to sustain it than their numbers and clannishness. As late as 1753 even so liberal a spirit as Benjamin Franklin permits himself to be disturbed about them. In a letter to Peter Collinson he expresses the opinion that "measures of great temper are necessary with the Germans," and goes on to call them indiscreet, dull, credulous, ignorant and of inaccessible prejudices. It has a familiar ring:

> Not being used to liberty, they know not how to make a modest use of it. . . . In short, unless the stream of their importation could be turned from this to other colonies, they will soon so outnumber us that all the advantages that we have will, in my opinion, be not able to preserve our language, and even our government will become precarious.

Subsequent history made him out rather a poor prophet. In Franklin's own day, one of this "dull, credulous and ignorant" stock, Frederick A. Muhlenberg, acquired a sufficient knowledge of our language and government to enable him to serve as Speaker of the first House of Representatives under the federal constitution; and succeeding generations of Penn-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sylvania Dutch have contributed no less than six governors to the commonwealth. No one questions any more the desirability of this substantial element in our population, and today the Wisters and the Rittenhouses mix freely and unabashed with the Logans and the Norrises, with no demoralizing effects.

The early Germans were only the first of a succession of alien invasions that filled the nervous founding Fathers with concern for the safety and privileges of "His Majesty's subjects." The Scotch-Irish were the next terror to darken the horizon. Of all immigrant stocks, this turbulent breed appears to have made the worst impression on the decorous, property-minded colonial communities. Dignified pillars of church and state today who trace their ancestry to this sturdy race might perhaps be amazed to hear of the reception that greeted their forbears, migrating in the early eighteenth century. James Truslow Adams says in his Provincial America:

> Everywhere there was strong prejudice against them. . . . Those coming to Pennsylvania, however, became and remained unpopular. . . . Logan claimed that five families of them made more trouble than fifty of any other nationality, that they were harsh in their treatment of the Indians, and that they had no regard for land titles.

Swarming into the province, they overran "in an audacious and disorderly manner" the private preserve of the Penn's, Conestoga Manor, squatting there in defiance of the Quaker government in Philadelphia.

The Scotch-Irish continued to be a thorn in the side of the provincial authorities, going so far as to march on the city 1,000 strong in 1761 with an impudent demand that a few straggling Indian fugitives be turned over to them for massacre. These unfortunate natives were the remnant of a depleted band of Moravian converts, harmless and well-disposed, who had survived a murderous attack of these same Scotch-Irish on Conestoga Manor, and had fled to Philadelphia for protection. The raiders were only prevented from finishing their bloody work by an unexpected show of fight on the part of the younger element of Quakers, who, under the energetic leadership of Franklin, forgot their pacific principles for the nonce and turned out in force to defend their city.

The Scotch-Irish emigrated to Pennsylvania in large numbers, Franklin estimating that they formed one-third of the population early in the eighteenth century. At that time Senator Reed's native city of Pittsburgh was as Irish as Londonderry. A rereading of this chapter of his state's history might inspire a little charity in the breast of the Senator toward the shortcomings of subsequent immigrants.

Scotch-Irish turbulence was not cured in a generation. To their reputation as gunmen they added the distinction of being our earliest moonshiners when, after the formation of our government, they refused to pay the excise duties imposed by Congress on distillers and went as far as open rebellion in the famous Whiskey Insurrection.

There were extenuating circumstances for the outbreaks of these frontiersmen, of course, precisely as there are for peoples similarly situated today—arriving in a strange country and finding land and resources preëmpted by earlier settlers, and a life of drudgery and privation as their portion. In this connection, Adams draws an interesting parallel:

> For a very considerable part of the population, frontier conditions must have closely approximated those obtaining today among the first generation of immigrants such as the "Polacks" who take up abandoned farms in the East, or others whose standards of living we consider so "un-American." There was the same fierce and sordid struggle to obtain a foothold, so as to secure the means of subsistence, the same squalor and dirt, the same annual addition to the number of children.

If they were not tractable and law-abiding, these Scotch-Irish at least had the qualities of their defects. Their spirit, energy and independence—their very belligerency—made them ideal recruits for revolution. They aided vitally in the winning of independence.

From the earliest times there was a steady flow of Catholic Irish into the colonies, but during the nineteenth century the movement swelled to a flood. Providing as they did inexpensive manual labor for vast public projects then being undertaken, like the railroads and the canals, their entry was looked upon favorably, on the whole. It was only when they began to gain political power in the cities and to enter into economic competition with earlier deposits of the population that slumbering native prejudices burst forth anew. This condition developed in the thirties. The foreigner was called the outstanding issue of the day, resolutions were passed, and appeals made to Congress to take some action. In this agitation, no demand was made for exclusion of immigrants, or even for restriction; there was still too much pick and shovel work to be done for anything so drastic as that. The Native American party, into which the movement was crystallized, took its stand on a platform that called for withholding naturalization privileges from foreign-born and their debarment from public office. Curiously enough, this party first saw the light in Germantown, that suburb of Philadelphia founded and largely settled by the Palatine immigrants whose entry a century earlier had been so widely opposed. Organized in 1834, it attracted a certain following for a while, electing several mayors in Philadelphia. Confessedly directed against "Irish Papists," the Native American agitation took violent form, marked by demonstrations in the city's streets and culminating in the firing of a nunnery, the homes of many Catholics, and two churches, one of which, Saint Augustine's, was demolished.

Know-nothingism ("the Order of the Star Spangled Banner"!) a recrudescence of the Nativist movement,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was particularly strong in Pennsylvania, electing a mayor in Philadelphia and, according to Horace Greeley, capturing virtually the state's entire delegation to the Thirty-fifth Congress. Furthermore, Philadelphia was chosen as friendly ground for the party's convention in 1855, at which Millard Fillmore was nominated for the Presidency. Incidentally, Fillmore succeeded in winning but a single state in the election—and that state Maryland! The record of the "Free State," if truth be told, is hardly better than Pennsylvania's on this issue. As early as 1699 there was a statute on her books designed "to prevent too great a number of Irish Papists being imported into this province" and carrying a twenty-shilling head tax on all Irish servants brought in.

The eighties marked a turning-point in immigration. The tide attained unprecedented proportions in these years, the normal flow from northern countries being augmented by the vanguard of the movement from southern and eastern Europe. The new arrivals no longer stopped along the crowded eastern seaboard, but penetrated into the interior, now becoming rapidly industrialized, creating a social and economic problem wherever they settled in large numbers. With this development, immigration, hitherto sectional, became national in its implications, and the country at large began to share the familiar apprehension of seaboard states like New York, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. Industrial depression, occurring at this time, widespread labor disturbances—frequently involving alien agitators and strikers—and the final exhaustion of the public domain further inflamed public opinion of the nation as a whole on the subject. At about this time Congress seriously took up the task of regulation, hitherto in the hands of the individual states, the Supreme Court having decided in 1875 that immigration was a matter for federal action.

Thereafter Pennsylvania's voice, though still raised, was drowned in the general outcry. But we hear it now and then. It received refined but bitter utterance through Elizabeth Robins, returned from a lengthy sojourn abroad to find her quiet Quaker city a polyglot metropolis. Miss Robins, Papist herself, can hardly be accused of anti-Catholic feeling in the matter; hers are sentimental regrets over a vanishing society, "seen through the witchery of intervening years." Much the same emotion stirs William Bullitt in his single, savage Philadelphia novel—inclining in his case somewhat to anti-Semitism. The Anti-Semitic Society itself, indeed, has a Philadelphian for president.

On a lower level, the old anti-alien ardor still smolders, readily fanned into flame by events like the last election, but it is becoming more and more rural and subterranean in its manifestations. The press has learned caution, and politically the "national blocs" have begun to loom formidably enough in the electorate to awe the average run of office-seeker. So formidable, indeed, that when Senator Reed yields to his pet phobia in the Senate chamber it must greatly perturb his as yet unseated colleague, Mr. Vare. It is an open secret that the solid Democratic vote of the Vare wards in the presidential election was something more than enfranchised thirst. Wine casks are too plentiful in South Philadelphia cellars for that. The truth is, the heavy Italian population in this section was killing two birds with one ballot, paying its respects to Mr. Reed as well as to prohibition. It had not forgotten Mr. Reed's filibuster on this same national-origins matter in the closing hours of the last Congress. And it will not forget again.

CHURCH AND STATE IN JAPAN

By JOHANNES LAURES

SINCE the termination of the persecution in the seventies of the nineteenth century, the Catholic Church has enjoyed liberty in the Land of the Rising Sun. A government proclamation in 1873 abolished the old laws against Christianity and gave every citizen freedom of religious worship. This government proclamation was followed by a similar one in 1876. There was, however, no formal law that guaranteed religious liberty until 1889, when the new constitution was enacted. Even then the matter was settled only in a general way in that every Japanese citizen was given the right of becoming a member of a Christian denomination, "in so far as peace and order and his duties as a subject should not be threatened thereby." Shinto, Buddhism and Christianity were to enjoy equal rights, at least theoretically. A definite law concerning the practical execution of this constitutional enactment was to follow later.

The first attempt in this respect was made in 1898 but proved a complete failure. Meanwhile many government regulations have been issued dealing almost exclusively with Buddhism and Shinto, so that these religious organizations were indeed in a less favorable condition than the various Christian denominations. Thus it was but natural that they endeavored to accelerate the enactment of a law that would give equal treatment to all religions. At last a draft of the Religions Bill was laid before the House of Peers in 1927 but met with great opposition. As a result, it was never introduced into the lower House. At the same time a vigorous campaign was launched against it by the various religious organizations, above all by the Buddhists and Protestants.

The reason why the Religions Bill was so strongly opposed was the fact that it seemed to endanger the freedom of worship guaranteed by the constitution

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of 1889. Nor was this apprehension without foundation. Even the name of the bill seemed to indicate that the Minister of Education was to be the dictator in matters of religion; it was provided that the Minister should be entitled to stop the activities of a religious organization on the mere "suspicion" that these might be detrimental to the public welfare. Thus the Minister of Education would practically have enjoyed the power to decide whether a religion was to be considered salutary or detrimental to the general welfare. This clause was primarily meant to prevent excessive sectarianism among Buddhists, but it was also directly opposed to the Protestant principle according to which everyone should have the right of founding a new religion. Nor would this provision of the law have been free from danger for the spread of Catholicism. Any vigorous effort in this direction could have been frustrated on the mere "suspicion" that it menaced peace and general welfare.

Another clause which caused great opposition, especially on the part of Protestant denominations, was the paragraph concerning the qualifications of a religious worker. The law demanded as a minimum requirement a middle school education and in addition at least two years of a professional training. The Salvation Army would have been hit hardest by this provision, since many of its officers have had no regular middle school training. Another stumbling block was the exclusion of ex-convicts from the post of religious workers. The Japan Advertiser notes that:

> the criminal law punishes offenses but not offenders themselves. There are many instances in which religion has converted criminals into good men. Persons engaged in [works of] salvation are mostly those who comprehended the crimes they had committed, so the prohibition of converted criminals from self-sacrificing service means their exclusion from religious life.

The opposition in the House of Peers, the protests of various religious bodies and perhaps also the immediate need of passing other more important bills induced the government to pigeonhole the Religions Bill in 1927. It has, nevertheless, not entirely given up the idea of a religious bill in some form or another, and this so much the more as the National Council of Buddhist Temples has spared no efforts to have matters of religion definitely settled by universal law. A new scheme has been drawn up which avoids or changes the objectionable points of the old Religions Bill. The new draft was approved by a general meeting of the Special Commission of the Ministry of Education on January 18, 1929, and is expected to be turned over to the Board of Legislation for inspection. It is now under discussion by a special commission composed of thirty members, eight Buddhist priests, five Shinto priests, two Christian preachers and fifteen scholars, members of the Diet and the Privy Council and other government officials. The authorities hope to have it in proper form to submit to the Diet soon.

The new draft is only a revised form of the old bill, but noteworthy changes have been made. The old name of Religions Bill has been replaced by that of Religious Organizations Bill. This change, though apparently slight, is meant to meet the objection of having the Minister of Education made dictator in matters of religion. Whereas, according to the old draft, every new religious organization had to apply for its recognition to the Minister of Education, it is now sufficient to report to the Ministry within fourteen days after the foundation of the new religion. According to the Religions Bill the Minister claimed the right of stopping activities of religious bodies on the mere suspicion of their being detrimental to the public welfare, but the new bill gives him merely the right of stepping in when those activities are evidently opposed to the common weal. For the same reason the authorities may also limit or prohibit the propagation of a religious creed and observance of religious ceremonies or rites whenever they deem that such practice is prejudicial to peace and order and inconsistent with the duty of subjects. The settling of matters of "religious ceremony and creed" is, however, explicitly excepted from the Minister's activities.

Concerning the qualifications of religious workers the new bill states that such persons must be more than twenty years old, with an education at least equivalent to that of middle school or girls' high school and an additional two years' professional course in the religion they are connected with. Hence the only concession on the part of the government is the possibility of replacing a middle school education by some other equivalent. The measure excluding convicts and other persons who had suffered in their good name from becoming religious teachers is also somewhat mitigated in the new draft; it provides that persons under bankruptcy and unable to rehabilitate, and persons who serve a term of two years' imprisonment, may engage as religious teachers, providing that more than two years have elapsed. The Minister of Education may also stop a religious teacher from carrying on his work when he recognizes that the conduct on the part of the teacher violates peace and order, demoralizes custom or interferes with a subject's duties.

These are the principal changes in the Religions Bill and the ones which were mainly insisted upon by the various religious organizations. According to the opinion of the Buddhists and Protestants it is a great improvement over the old draft, in that the law guarantees everyone the right of founding a new religion. The right of establishing an independent church was originally granted to Christians only, but the new bill extends it to Buddhism and all other religious beliefs except Shinto. Another noteworthy change in the bill is its brevity. Whereas the old draft comprised no less than 130 articles the new bill has only ninety-eight. One important change was meant to win over Buddhism and Shinto; the sections having to do with the transfer of land owned by shrines and temples were struck out and will be treated by a special law.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There seems to be reasonable hope for the success of the new bill. The Buddhists will, on the whole, give it their wholehearted support, although some individual members may disagree. If the bill should be passed Buddhism could no longer complain of not being treated on an equal footing with other beliefs. The Protestants also find less fault with the new bill than with the old draft. Yet the Presbyterian Church considers Article 8 as an interference in the self-government of religious organizations. This article provides that the Minister of Education may, whenever it is necessary for the promotion of public interest, undertake to maintain order among organizations of different religions. Articles 6 and 7 are also objected to, because they invest the local authorities with power to supervise the affairs of religious organizations. The Presbyterians declare that the law increases the opportunities for the governors to abuse their power. Such an arrangement, it is pointed out, would put the Governor practically in the position of a Pope. Other points objected to are the qualifications of religious workers and the requirement for religious bodies to report their basic doctrines and the structure of their organizations to the Minister of Education.

The Catholics also apprehend that Article 8 may possibly lead to unjustified governmental interference, but we have nothing to fear concerning the requirements for religious teachers or the obligation of reporting the bases of our organization, because all Catholic religious teachers are highly educated and sectarianism is out of question in the Catholic Church. It is to be put down as an improvement that the Church may, according to both the old and the new bill, incorporate as a moral person.

Speaking in general, it is highly desirable that the relations between the state and the Church be regulated by definite law, and for this reason the new bill is to be welcomed as a fairly good solution of this delicate problem. One must also acknowledge the fact that the government has represented at least two Christian denominations in the special research commission for the revising of the old bill. Father Tsuchihashi, S.J., of the Catholic University, Tokio, and Bishop Kogoro Uzaki of the Methodist Church, were members of this commission. This shows, at all events, that the government was eager to please all of the parties involved.

To a Disappointed Pilgrim

You had nowhere to rest your discontented heart,
Loving that heart too well to set it free.
You came with suitcase and with manuscripts
And spread your luggage in a spacious room
And leaned on a railing over a pepper-tree,
Over cornstalks and banana plants taller than yourself.
You faced a mountain range holding a lake;
But in all the great homes of cloud you had nowhere to go.

WITTER BYNNER.

COMMUNICATIONS

MR. MENCKEN ONCE MORE

Oyster Bay, L. I.

TO the Editor:—In your issue of June 5, Louise Carey Rossett most unjustly attacks you for saying a few deserved good words of H. L. Mencken. She further attempts analogy between the latter and the Action Française.

I respectfully submit that it is high time to bring this controversy down to first principles. The difficulties and necessary limitations of coöperation between those of different faiths are obvious enough. Mr. Mencken is, I suppose, a pagan; he believes in human instincts and in the human reason. With due reservations, the Catholic believes in both, plus Revelation. The individual Protestant or Bible Christian believes in neither, but interprets Revelation after a fashion hostile to both. Therefore it is necessary that pagans and Catholics should ally themselves to resist the increasing tyranny of the Bible Christian.

Surely your correspondent must know that Catholic ethics are enlargement of the noble pagan foundations of Aristotle, whereas it is the melancholy fact that the ethics of Bible Christians seem to be falling to the level of irrational taboos. If, by any chance, she could care for a more detailed treatment of the subject she will find it in the epilogue of my little book on The Inquisition.

HOFFMAN NICKERSON.

Washington, D. C.

TO the Editor:—As one who profits by constant reading of The Commonweal, permit me to congratulate you for publishing, in your current issue, the illuminating communication of Louise Carey Rossett, re your editorial on Mr. Mencken's recent attack upon Protestantism. I say "illuminating" because the connection between the crude, though virile, "200-percent-American" type of the latter's intellect, and the subtle nihilistic philosophy of the lately-condemned Action Française, had quite escaped me.

Instinctively all along, I have shrunk from the grossness and crudity of the American Mercury as from something evil, only occasionally glancing down its columns in order to assure myself that prejudice was not warping my judgment. The result has been an increasing conviction that for the clientele of The Commonweal the opinion of Mr. Mencken does not matter, notwithstanding an occasional "community of interest between Catholicism and himself." This appearance of similarity of interest, based as it is on ideals differing as night from day, as good from evil, when stressed by The Commonweal carries with it a sense of confusion of issues.

ELIZABETH S. KITE.

PROFESSOR BARNES AND SECULARISM

Notre Dame, Ind.

TO the Editor:—You say that Dom Walsh in his excellent little study, Professor Barnes and Secularism, "examines some of the evidence underlying the discussion" of the science-religion problem. This is true; he sifts the evidence in a small part of this big field, and I think his willingness to look for and at the evidence, and to be guided by it, and to wait for more—in a word, to be open-minded—is as striking as the pertinent facts and theories which he cites.

A couple of students asked me some days ago if they might sum up Dr. Barnes's views for a week's work. Certainly, they might; it was a live topic, and I only requested them to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

get the meat of his arguments, any "evidence" he might present. The boys read for a day or two and were disappointed. Dr. Barnes has not presented evidence.

But there are many unthinking thinkers, and my chief interest was in the attitude and method of Dr. Barnes and Dom Walsh. The latter seems to me the man of open mind in this instance. I am well aware that assertions and counter-assertions are often made at random for both secularism and orthodoxy, and I note with Dom Walsh that prejudice may be on either side or on both, and that it is hard to put off even those ways of thinking found to be wrong. But I am surprised at Dr. Barnes's sureness—he is "rather too apodictic about the security of his position." As an undergraduate says of him, he seems to have shut himself up in a bag. I read, implicit in his writings: "I do not wish to learn, and the reason is that I do not need to learn. I know. These are the dogmas. . . . I name them. It is for you to believe them." This is not like science, which proceeds an inch at a time, and makes its claims with care and great caution.

Dom Walsh keeps what is known distinct from what is merely supposed. Besides, he feels a mental hunger, which is a disposition that we must find or beget in ourselves and others if we are to seek and digest strong mental food. He seems to say: "I am in search of solutions. I hope to get as near to solving the big problem of life and death as the best thinking and the best modern discovery will take us. I do not know all the sciences, but I am willing to be taught."

In other words, he seems to have the scholarly, scientific spirit which the new institute of mediaeval studies at Saint Michael's, Toronto, promises is to mark its endeavors—the spirit of "humility, honesty and careful work." This (I think) is something that we religionists and irreligionists have often to learn over again. It is so much more effective and Christian than abuse and assertion.

REV. LEO R. WARD, C.S.C.

La Crosse, Wis.

TO the Editor:—Having read your editorial comments in the issue of March 13 on the course of lectures being given by the Paulist Fathers in New York City, I thought a word on our similar efforts here in the Middle-West might be of some interest.

At the suggestion of the bishop of La Crosse, the Right Reverend A. J. McGavick, a series of talks was begun last fall, based upon the Calvert Series of books. The first, given by the reverend principal dealt with The Catholic Church and the Bible, and continued for some eight weeks; the second is now being conducted by the diocesan chancelor on The Catholic Church and Science. There are ninety enrolled in the classes, including a number of very keenly interested non-Catholics. Most of those attending purchase copies of the Calvert Series for themselves.

To obviate any misunderstandings it was made clear at the outset that these courses in apologetics are not intended to take the place of the instructions required by diocesan law before any prospective convert can consider entering the Church.

True, the ninety or so whom we instruct directly are not many, but we feel that even ninety twentieth-century apostles can do a very great deal toward correcting the many false impressions which each of them may find within his own circle of acquaintance. And we trust that this step will aid us materially in realizing within this community the very apropos motto of Aquinas, "Fides et Scientia."

REV. LESTER W. SEEMAN.

BOOKS

His Amorous Highness

Henry the Eighth, by Francis Hackett. New York: Horace Liveright. $3.00.

WHEN a period of history teems with accessible facts, as does the reign of Henry VIII, an author faces the serious problem of selection. In such a case—as Professor Pollard, an authority on the two Tudor Henrys, once remarked—the integrity of a historian is to be tested less by the accuracy of his facts than by his choice and use of them.

Mr. Hackett puts his emphasis on Henry's wives. Their names provide his sectional headings and their relations to the king lend piquancy to the story, accounting for its popularity with readers who would otherwise scarcely trouble to acquaint themselves with the author's limpid style, his psychological insight and his human sympathy. As it is, they probably skip those parts in the narrative which contain striking historical syntheses. In this book of nearly four hundred fifty closely printed pages, they have too many opportunities to feast upon the spice.

A careful reader should turn at once to the last section. It is called The Background and is in reality an excellent introduction which the author's desire to exploit the sensational betrayed him into putting at the end of the book—with an apology in the foreword for including it at all.

This introductory background gives an account of Europe in the sixteenth century not vastly different from that to be found in the texts of professional historians, though much more smartly put and with those occasional lapses into exaggeration likely to be found in very clever writing. Mr. Hackett touches controversial points and, not unlike the professional historians—and others—has his own opinions. He believes the Reformation was long overdue. Dr. Fosdick once declared it came too soon. Catholics are convinced that it should never have come at all—except, of course, within the Church, where it undoubtedly was overdue. The author's attitude toward the continental religious revolt is a little too laudatory and therefore a little too naive. His picture of the cynical, personal and dynastic politics of sixteenth-century Europe is sketched with a surer hand.

Turning to England and to Henry's wrathful career, one wishes for less information about that egoist's matrimonial vicissitudes and for more information about the politics which changed the history of England and the world. Nevertheless, in spite of this personal and domestic emphasis, Mr. Hackett does not regale us with any prolonged psychoanalysis in the orthodox Freudian manner. To be sure, Henry's mistresses and personally selected wives were of such varied types that they could not all have resembled his mother, and Henry's nerves, temper, brutality, mendacity and other vagaries could scarcely be ascribed to sex repressions; but other authors have done wilder things with equally unpromising material.

Nevertheless, it remains to be deplored that in this present story of Henry's reign, the author has usually allowed the court to eclipse the people, personalities to dwarf ideas and the evanescent to obscure the permanent. There are passages of eloquence and insight in the author's portrayal of the six women whose lives were most closely linked with Henry's. A reader will remember his moving picture of the last moments of Catherine of Aragon, who, writing to the king, "in a fugue of pride, brave, desolate and magnificent, signed herself for the last time: 'Katherine, Queene of England.'" And a reader

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will chuckle over the author's allusions to the common sense of the charmless Anne of Cleves, to whom Henry "seemed . . . at once a little comic and a little repulsive," and from whom "she separated . . . with an alacrity that another man might have resented."

Henry as an international figure and Henry as the founder of a national church are less conspicuous in this volume than Henry as an oft-married man. It would be unfair to say that the author ignores the other phases. We note the king and Wolsey shaping England's foreign policy along the lines of that subtly Machiavellian, but brilliantly successful principle of "maintaining the balance of power." We see Cromwell, a "predatory animal," replacing More, "a man who asked to live and let live," and we catch distant glimpses of the looting of the abbeys. We follow Norfolk as he rides against rebellion in the north. But Mr. Hackett has not plumbed the philosophical significance of these things.

There are passages which bring up old questions, such as the rôle of the Pope in Henry's famous suit for nullity of marriage. Anyone consulting the sober pages of Gairdner or Lingard will agree that Clement does not emerge from the first stages of the contest as a fearless defender of the marriage bond. There was not only the hesitation engendered by the conflicting pressure of the emperor and of Henry's agents, and the studied delays. There was above all the secret decretal bull which Campeggio carried with him to England and afterward destroyed. The Pope's early confusion was natural if not heroic, and Mr. Hackett knows how to interpret the natural. It may be mentioned parenthetically that he is less at home in the realm of the supernatural, as when he calls baptism an "antique tribal rite," thus adding to the offenses which popular writers are wont to perpetrate in the respected names of evolution and comparative religion.

On the subject of the divorce, the author presents no new fact and adduces no new interpretation. It is this barrenness of originality which, added to his purely personal emphasis, disappoints the student of history who thirsts for new knowledge and new understanding of a period bristling with controversial points. Mr. Hackett has written a readable book, but he has not made a contribution to history. He has "toiled in the archives" but failed "to find the little fact which makes the difference." He throws no new light on the moot question as to how far Henry's policies retarded and how far they advanced the progress of England. He need not have feared that a few discoveries would have brought to an end the thrilling debates of the savants. Even Henry VIII was unable to enforce a statute called "An Act for the Abolition of Diversity of Opinion."

GEORGIANA PUTNAM MCENTEE.

Portraits of Ancestors

As God Made Them, by Gamaliel Bradford. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. $3.50.

IN A school in the Balkans conducted by French nuns, on the French plan of studies, in French, the little Slavic, Greek, Armenian and Jewish orphans recite their history lesson in the sacred words with which it begins all over France: "Nos ancêtres les Gaulois. . . ." Those Gallic ancestors bear something of the same relation to Balkan and Asiatic youth (and even to many Frenchmen of the present day) as Gamaliel Bradford's men bear to modern America.

Bradford does indeed uncover "the richness and charm of our American heritage." It is a sign of maturity that we once more feel the reality of this heritage and feel, too, that it is a proud one, not to be discarded as something foreign to us or outworn and threadbare. Between the myth-makers, the debunkers and those impatient of a society with which they seemed at first to be in no way connected, our poor "ancêtres les Gaulois as God made them," fell for a time on evil days.

Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, John Calhoun, Francis Child and Asa Gray are the principal dwellers in this graceful house that Bradford has built for their better lodging.

Of the three first we all have some knowledge, but who knows Francis Child and Asa Gray today outside of the ever-dwindling "Brahmin caste"? Yet they are real and estimable ancestors. I am more glad that he has brought back these two and made them comfortable than I am for all the others.

It is almost unfriendly to criticize his "own peculiar psychography" but I think it should be said that Bradford is less a historian than a painter, and that he colors his portraits, as artists will, with his own special pigment. That is particularly true of his analysis of political philosophies: "Clay was essentially, constructively, triumphantly American"; "Clay's America was the America of the future, however destiny might shape it"; "like Lincoln he believed in the mass of the people, their political honesty and sanity. He had not a trace of the profound distrust which affects so many wise men today, and which is the mere reaction from the too great hopes and enthusiasms of a century ago." Of whom was Clay thinking, and of whom Bradford?

Clay thought serenely of an America such as he knew and had experienced, a safe America, therefore, "however destiny might shape it." Clay thought at times even of a political Pan-America, as Seward thought the United States of America embodying both continents, a literal league of nations; but equally Clay was thinking of an America in which, ethnologically, the various new groups should slip quietly into place without disturbance. His America was the product of that fusion which had made a new thing, the English race and nation in Europe, and which, transplanted to America, had made again a new thing, the beginning of an American race. New people had come in and were absorbing into a community already homogeneous. Clay and the rest could not realize the changes to be caused by the planting of what amounted to great new European colonies in America, isolated, sometimes hostile but bearing fullest American citizenship. It is that very process of growth which has made of Clay, Webster, Calhoun and the rest "nos ancêtres, les Gaulois."

Of Calhoun, he says, laboriously fair: "He professed at all times to be, and no doubt was, a lover of the Union, but it was the Union as he conceived it, not transformed or disfigured by encroaching Federalism, but the pure ideal of the Fathers. . . ." Was there any such "pure ideal"? Certainly none defined as held by "all, at all times, everywhere." There were at least two quite definite political philosophies, quite incompatible, but each nevertheless respectable, though Bradford evidently does not admit respectability in that one held by Calhoun. Webster and Clay preferred their own and maneuvered for ten years to postpone the inevitable recourse to arms for a decision, but Calhoun has a place in political thought no less respectable than that of Lincoln. One must not be partizan if one is to understand our ancestors, the Gauls. Unless one balances those things which occupied their minds, their portrait may be good painting but not necessarily a speaking likeness.

WILLIAM FRANKLIN SANDS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GOOD COUNSEL COLLEGE, White Plains, N. Y.
A CATHOLIC COLLEGE FOR WOMEN
Registered by the University of the State of New York with power to confer degrees
PEDAGOGICAL COURSE. BEAUTIFUL LOCATION.
Forty Minutes from New York. Resident and Non-Resident Students
Catalogues on application to the Secretary

PIUS X SCHOOL OF LITURGICAL MUSIC
COLLEGE OF THE SACRED HEART
133rd Street and Convent Avenue, New York
Thirteenth Summer Session June 25—August 3
COURSES OFFERED
Gregorian Chant
The Liturgy
Justine Ward Method of Teaching Music, Courses I, II, III
Gregorian Accompaniment
Advanced Chironomy Harmony—Counterpoint
Musical Theory—Lessons in Voice Production, Organ, Violin, Piano
Registrations, June 24th, earlier if desired Cathedral 1334

ST. XAVIER COLLEGE
For Women
4928 COTTAGE GROVE AVENUE,, CHICAGO, ILL.
Conducted by the Sisters of Mercy
Liberal Arts Course, Pre-Medical, Music, Art
Teachers' Promotional Credit Classes
Autumn, Winter, and Spring Quarters
Send for Announcement

VACATION JOYS

Summer days are coming
With hours full of joy.
Outdoor sports and pastimes
Call each girl and boy.
Tennis courts and beaches
Sailboats and canoes,
Your feet will gladly serve you
If you wear proper shoes.
Stylish shoes that fit well
With comfort may be worn,
Nothing to mar your pleasure
If they're from Pediforme.

Regardless of the nature of your foot troubles, "PEDIFORME" shoes will aid you to regain normalcy. Write for our FREE Style Book K that tells how to overcome foot ills in the natural way.

THE PEDIFORME SHOE COMPANY
36 W. 36 St. New York
29 Washington Pl. East Orange, N. J.
322 Livingston St. Brooklyn

BURR PRINTING HOUSE
FOUNDED 1837
FRANKFORT AND JACOB STREETS
NEW YORK. N. Y.
CATALOGUES. MAGAZINES. BOOKS
AND COMMERCIAL PRINTING

Mother-in-Law

Dark Hester, by Anne Douglas Sedgwick. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

WHEN an only son marries a woman wholly alien in temperament and outlook to his mother's ideal of a wife, a complex arises so packed with psychological possibilities that only the sure hand of a capable novelist should be allowed to manage the material. Such a complex surrounds Monica Wilmott, the mother, Clive Wilmott, the son, and Hester Blakeston, the daughter-in-law; and one of our most competent novelists carries the situation along on a cushion of smooth prose to a comforting conclusion—for it is comforting to know that a "mother" complex is curable.

Monica is prejudiced against Hester—Hester with her wild, gipsy beauty, her clipping tongue, her yawning boredom. When Clive and Hester and their little son Robin move to the Crofts to be near Monica in Oddly Green, the latter misconstrues the act as a determination on Hester's part to flaunt power before her. When Monica discovers that Geofrey Ingpen, a gay old dog who has had amours in India and who is more than a little interested in the widow Monica Wilmott, is a lover of Hester's, she swiftly denounces Hester and stands waiting to see if Clive is finally convinced of the error of his choice. But he only becomes ill under the dual strain of defending his wife and reasoning with his mother. With Clive lying weak and tortured between them, Hester decides to leave him to return to newspaper work. Slowly Monica realizes that for Hester to part from the man and child she loves is sheer bravery of spirit; Hester insists that to stay would add to Clive's unhappiness. Monica questions her own logic and admits that perhaps this girl, even though of a flighty generation, may bring a noble sturdiness of devotion to marriage. Monica asks Hester to stay and the reader gets a last view of Hester nodding slow assent.

Monica and Hester are built up, layer upon layer. Neither steps boldly forth under the flash of a sentence: each rather emerges slowly but with precision as the events of the plot wall them round. Clive is shadowy in outline as he should be, because he is a mere spectator of this battle of feminine wits. Dark Hester adds one more laurel to Miss Sedgwick's name, already distinguished by The Little French Girl and other successful novels.

EDYTHE HELEN BROWNE.

Mediaevalism Unwashed

Life in the Middle Ages, Volumes I, II and III, by G. G. Coulton. New York: The Macmillan Company.

THE MEDIAEVAL GARNER, published in 1910, was an enormous volume which no more belonged in the brief case of a busy student than Dr. Johnson's Dictionary itself. Now a reissue of the work in four parts is in progress, and three neat, portable volumes have already appeared. In each case the material is grouped under a convenient if somewhat elastic heading—Religion, Folk-Lore and Superstition; Men and Manners; Chronicles, Science and Art. The Coulton method has not been changed, of course. Selections from less familiar mediaeval manuscripts and books are introduced by laconic and sometimes highly personal notes.

It must be admitted that the effect of these books is decidedly anti-romantic. They offer little to support those whose vision of the middle-ages is utopian, and who imagine that the Church had managed to transmute the old Adam into a wholly new

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Adam. In all probability Dr. Coulton desired to undermine that vision. Any fairly accomplished reader of mediaeval texts could suggest many passages having an entirely different connotation than attends the majority of those cited here. On the other hand, Life in the Middle Ages has a definite and positive value. It is based upon wide and intelligent reading, it serves up the meat of numerous interesting and inaccessible books, and throws a great deal of light upon "everyday mediaeval life." A Catholic scholar will by no means neglect Coulton, and will be grateful for all to be learned from him, though he can legitimately contend that the true picture of the past must introduce prominent characteristics which Dr. Coulton completely ignores.

PAUL CROWLEY.

Columbus for Hollywod

Unknown Lands, by Vicente Blasco Ibañez; translated by Arthur Livingston. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. $2.50.

NO INFALLIBLE estimate of an author's purpose can be made, but in criticizing Unknown Lands one feels sure that Vicente Blasco Ibañez has erred in writing with a strong weather eye directed toward Hollywood. Certainly such a consideration is needed to explain the weaving of his narrative of Columbus's first voyage to America on the warp of a paltry love story.

Ibañez's treatment of the discoverer of America belongs in the debunking category. His Columbus is a man of uncertain and possibly sinister ancestry; a self-seeker obsessed with his idea of a route westward to an opulent India over which he would lord it with the majestic title of Admiral Major of the Ocean Sea and Viceroy and Perpetual Governor of All New Found Land; a sailor whose skill was questionable and a navigator only in claim; a mediocrity whose pettiness and vanity ill matched the glory of an achievement which was accidental; a hypocritical penitent in his relations with Beatrice Enriquez de Arana, the mother of his beloved son. Historians need not be consulted to confute such a portrait since Ibañez makes no pretense of dealing soberly with actuality. The liberty a novelist can take with historical characters grows larger with time, but what Ibañez has wrought here is offered the reader with more than a little bitterness. Catholic Spain, united under the sovereignty of the houses of Castile and Aragon, is inferentially but no less certainly condemned. The Santa Hermandad shares evil repute with the Inquisition and stands in the background as the archdemon which threatens the happiness of hero and heroine.

Lucero, who had led the cloistral life of a wealthy Jewish girl, finds herself faced with marriage to a Catholic brute in order to escape the evils of conversion or banishment. She avoids her dilemma by eloping, disguised as a boy, with the village youth Fernando. Columbus shelters them in his entourage. They are constantly harassed by dangers and enemies and the novel is written from the view-point of their various coincidental deliverances. They make the trip to America where their most active enemy, who was in high command aboard the Santa Maria, is finally and unexcitingly killed in self-defense by Fernando. The problem of the lovers' future is solved, as it could have been in the first place, by Lucero's expedient and perfunctory conversion. In spite of this weakness of plot, there is much in the book that is entertaining and emotionally effective.

JOHN GILLAND BRUNINI.

The only Catholic Military School east of the Mississippi

A CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL

Conducted by The Brothers of the Christian School

Incorporated under the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York. A Reserve Officers Training Corps Unit of the United States Army. Member of the Association of Military Schools and Colleges of the United States. Essentially a military school, La Salle places primary emphasis on scholastic work. Military and Athletic preference is dependent on Academic standing.

While La Salle is a Catholic Academy, non-Catholics are admitted and no undue influence is exercised over their religious convictions.

Private rooms. Beautiful estate 156 acres; extensive athletic fields; golf course; one-half mile of sandy beach on the Great South Bay.

Resident Students Only

LA SALLE MILITARY ACADEMY

ON·THE·GREAT·SOUTH·BAY·OAKDALE·LONG·ISLAND

For other particulars address Reverend Brother Anselm, Director La Salle Military Academy, Oakdale, Long Island, N. Y. Sayville 900.

Georgetown Preparatory School

Garrett Park, Maryland

Country School
Conducted by the Jesuit Fathers
Regular Four-Year Classical
High School Course

Classes Limited — Private Rooms Only

Situated in the villa section of Montgomery County, Maryland, Eleven Miles from the National Capital. New South Wing has just been completed with accomodations for twenty additional resident students.

For information or catalogue apply HEADMASTER

GORHAM

ECCLESIASTICAL PRODUCTIONS

Rosaries	Candlesticks	Vases
Crucifixes	Ostensoria	Pyxis & Oil Stocks
Medals	Vestments	Triptychs

Altar Appointments — Church Decorations
Mosaics—Tablets—Stained Glass Windows

GORHAM
Fifth Avenue at 47th Street, New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MALVERN
Prep School
RESIDENT and Day School. Augustinian Fathers. 163-acre campus. Gymnasium. Lake. Athletic field. Supervised sports. New buildings and equipment. Preparation for leading colleges and technical schools. Lower school for 8th grade boys. Catalog. Registrar, Malvern, Pa.

BETHANY HOUSE
(Conducted for Women by the Maryknoll Sisters)
DELIGHTFULLY SITUATED AMONG THE WESTCHESTER HILLS
Spacious Grounds—Modern Structure—Excellent Table and Service
Chapel—Daily Mass
Rates: $4.00 per day and Upward, Including Meals
Sr. Directress, BETHANY HOUSE, Maryknoll, N. Y.

OUR LADY OF MERCY ACADEMY
Syosset, (Long Island) New York
A Residential and Day School for Girls.
Conducted by the Sisters of Mercy.

ST. WALBURGA'S ACADEMIC SCHOOL
630 Riverside Drive, New York City
Boarding and Day School for Girls, conducted by the Religious of the Society of the Holy Child Jesus. Approved by the University of the State of New York. Accredited by the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Middle States and Maryland.

SUMMER VACATION TRIPS and CRUISES
Europe, Nova Scotia, New Foundland, St. Lawrence and Saguenay, Bermuda, Porto-Rico, Havana and West Indies. California (Water Rail), The Great Lakes, Motor Coach and Rail Tours to New England and Canada. To those considering THEIR VACATION PLANS will be pleased to mail descriptive literature and submit itineraries on request to
FARLEY TRAVEL AGENCY 535—5th Ave., N. Y. City Phone 8390-8391 Murray Hill

IRISH HAMS and BACON
Hungarian Salami
German Frankfurters
Westphalian Hams
M. H. GREENEBAUM, INC.
220 GREENWICH STREET NEW YORK

St. Hilda Guild, Inc.
CHURCH VESTMENTS, ALTAR LINEN
Ecclesiastical Embroidery
Conferences with reference to the adornment of churches
Old Embroidery Transferred
131 EAST 47th STREET NEW YORK
Vanderbilt 8761

Briefer Mention

New Light on Piers Plowman, by Allan H. Bright. New York: Oxford University Press. $3.00.

THEORIES in plenty have grown up around Langland's (or somebody else's) famous poem. Mr. Bright's is fairly simple and sensible, devoting itself to two kinds of evidence at least relatively new. The first variety is biographical and leads to the conclusion that Langland was born at Longlands, near Ledbury, that the opening stanzas of his poem describe a view that may still in a measure be enjoyed near there, and that the account of himself introduced into the narrative is fairly accurate. The second variety establishes (to the author's satisfaction, at any rate) the claim that one poet wrote the A, B and C texts. It is a careful and deft bit of research which no student of the problems involved can ignore. Professor R. W. Chambers has contributed an interesting critical introduction to the volume.

The Harvest, by L. H. Bailey. New York: The Macmillan Company. $1.50.

LIBERTY HYDE BAILEY is the dean of American writers on rural life. For more than forty years associated with our leading agricultural colleges, chairman of the Roosevelt Country Life Commission, editor of valuable series of farm reference works, author of a score of works, scientific, philosophical and poetical, his latest interpretation of farm life, The Harvest, garners his own ripened thoughts, the fruit of a lifetime of seasoned reflection. This little book cannot be synopsized for it is not theoretical. It is practical and poetic, and must be read instead of sampled. It is one of the Background Books in which Mr. Bailey expounds a wholesome philosophy of the holy earth.

CONTRIBUTORS

WILLIAM C. MURPHY, JR., is Chief of Senate Staff of the United States Daily, Washington, D. C.

LOUIS GINSBERG, a teacher of English in the Paterson High School, Paterson, New Jersey, is an American poet.

DR. KARL SCHAEZLER, critic of music, resides in Munich, Germany, and is a member of the staff of Hochland. His paper, Music in France and Germany, published herewith, was translated by George N. Shuster.

FRANK RAHILL is a member of the staff of the Philadelphia Public Ledger.

REV. JOHANNES LAURES, S.J., is professor of political economy in the Catholic University of Tokio.

WITTER BYNNER, poet and playwright, is the author of Caravan; Cake; and The Pamphlet Poets.

GEORGIANA PUTNAM MCENTEE is an instructor in history in Hunter College, New York City, and the author of The Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain.

WILLIAM FRANKLIN SANDS, formerly in the American diplomatic service, is an authority on international affairs.

EDYTHE HELEN BROWNE is a writer of historical and biographical studies.

PAUL CROWLEY is a literary critic for the American reviews.

JOHN GILLAND BRUNINI is a member of The Commonweal staff.

COLLEGE OF SAINT ELIZABETH
MORRISTOWN, NEW JERSEY
A Catholic college for women offering courses leading to Bachelor degrees in arts, sciences and music. Registered by State Boards of Education in N. Y., N. J. and Pa. Courses in Home Economics and Music. Campus of 400 acres. Tennis, hockey, riding and other sports. *Catalogue*
Address Dean, Box C. Convent Station, New Jersey

THE URSULINE ACADEMY
A College Preparatory School for Girls
Resident and Day Pupils
Chartered by the Regents of New York
Grand Concourse at 165th St., New York City

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED